

**REMARKS**

Claims 13-19 and 33-37 drawn to a method for making a semiconductor device, are pending in this case. Of these, claims 13 and 33 are independent claims from which the remaining claims depend.

**35 U.S.C § 102**

The examiner rejected claims 13-19, 33-34 and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,531,328 to Chen. Regarding independent claims 13 and 33, the examiner found that all the limitations in these claims can be found in Chen. Applicant does not agree with the examiner's findings. For example, Applicant does not agree that Chen discloses a method for coating a plurality of semiconductor devices or LEDs comprising the step of providing mold with a formation cavity. There are other differences between the invention in claims 13 and 33 that distinguish them from Chen. However, to further distinguish claims 13 and 33 from Chen, each has been amended as follows:

"providing a mold with a formation cavity for holding a plurality of semiconductor devices, said formation cavity at least partially defined by opposing upper and lower sections"

Support for this amendment can be found in the specification and claims as originally filed, and specifically, page 19, line 29 to page 20, line 1.

Chen does not disclose a formation cavity or a formation cavity with opposing upper and lower sections. Instead, Chen generally discloses a method for forming grooves 11 in a silicon wafer 8 using KOH, with the grooves 11 having walls that decline at an angle of 54.74 degrees. An LED chip 3 is placed on an

Appl. No. 10/666,399  
Amdt. Dated August 15, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 13, 2005

electrode surface in the groove and a bonding resin 5 is dispensed. FIG. 20 shows that a number of LED chips can be placed on the same groove to obtain a single SMD LED providing high brightness. Chen, however, does not disclose teach or suggest the limitation of providing a mold formation cavity having opposing upper and lower sections.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 33 are allowable over Chen. Claims 14-17, 34-37 depend from claims 13 and 33, and are also allowable.

35 U.S.C § 103

The examiner rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,252,254 to Soules et al. Claim 35 depends from allowable claim 33. Accordingly, this claim is also allowable.

Claims 16 and 36 have been amended so that they are consistent with amended claims 13 and 33.

Applicant believes that all the claims are in condition for allowance and a timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jaye G. Heybl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,661

August 15, 2005

KOPPEL JACOBS PATRICK & HEYBL  
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite #107  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360  
(805) 373-0060